arXiv:1404.1051v1 [q-fin.TR] 25 Mar 2014

Microscopic determinants of the weak-form efficiency of an artificial order-driven stock market

Jian Zhou[a], Gao-Feng Gu[a,b], Zhi-Qiang Jiang[a,b], Xiong Xiong[c,d], Wei Zhang[c,d], Wei-Xing Zhou[a,b,e,*]

[a]*School of Business, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China*
[b]*Research Center for Econophysics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China*
[c]*College of Management and Economics, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China*
[d]*China Center for Social Computing and Analytics, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China*
[e]*Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China*

Abstract

Stock markets are efficient in the weak form in the sense that no significant autocorrelations can be identified in the returns. However, the microscopic mechanisms are unclear. We aim at understanding the impacts of order flows on the weak-form efficiency through computational experiments based on an empirical order-driven model. Three possible determinants embedded in the model are investigated, including the tail heaviness of relative prices of the placed orders characterized by the tail index α_x, the degree of long memory in relative prices quantified by its Hurst index H_x, and the strength of long memory in order direction depicted by H_x. It is found that the degree of autocorrelations in returns (quantified by its Hurst index H_r) is negatively correlated with α_x and H_x and positively correlated with H_s. In addition, the values of α_x and H_x have negligible impacts on H_r, whereas H_s exhibits a dominating impact on H_r. Our results suggest that stock markets are complex adaptive systems and self-organize to a critical state in which the returns are not correlated.

Keywords: Market efficiency; Order-driven model; Computational experiment; Order direction; Long memory

*Corresponding author. Address: 130 Meilong Road, P.O. Box 114, School of Business, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China; Telephone: +86-21-64253634.

Email address: wxzhou@ecust.edu.cn (Wei-Xing Zhou)

1. Introduction

The Efficient Markets Hypothesis (EMH) is one of the cornerstones of modern finance and there are three major versions of the hypothesis: weak form, semi-strong form, and strong form (Fama, 1970, 1991). The weak form efficiency hypothesis suggests that asset prices are unpredictable using historical prices. The study of the weak-form EMH can be traced back to Bachelier (1900), who suggests that speculative prices follow random walks. Early empirical evidence and theoretical analysis supporting the random walk hypothesis (Cowles 3rd, 1933; Working, 1934; Kendall, 1953; Osborne, 1959; Cootner, 1964; Samuelson, 1965; Mandelbrot, 1966).

A classical approach to test the random walk hypothesis is to calculate the Hurst index H of return time series (Mandelbrot, 1971). A time series is uncorrelated if its Hurst index $H = 0.5$, antipersistent if $H < 0.5$, or persistent if $H > 0.5$ (Mandelbrot and Van Ness, 1968). Different methods have been utilized to estimate Hurst indexes of financial return time series and controversial results are reported (see, for instance, Cajueiro and Tabak, 2004; Alvarez-Ramirez et al., 2008; Cajueiro and Tabak, 2008; Mishra et al., 2011; Jiang et al., 2014). We note that a well-designed statistical method is necessary to conclude the presence of long memory in returns. It is more likely that returns are uncorrelated in long term and inefficient in certain short time periods (Jiang et al., 2014). However, we are not going to devote to this debate. Rather, we attempt to identify possible microscopic determinants in order flows that impact the correlation structure of financial return time series.

In this work, we perform computational experiments using an order-driven model. The seminal model was proposed by Mike and Farmer (2008), mimicking the processes of order placement and cancellation. The Mike-Farmer (MF) model is able to reproduce the main stylized facts of stock returns, such as power-law tails in the return distribution and absence of long memory in return time series. However, the MF model fails to reproduce the phenomenon of volatility clustering (Mike and Farmer, 2008). Gu and Zhou (2009) propose a modified MF (MMF) model which successfully reproduces all these stylized facts. There are three possible determinants embedded in the MMF model, including the tail heaviness of relative prices of the placed orders characterized by the tail index α_x, the degree of long memory in relative prices quantified by its Hurst index H_x,

and the strength of long memory in order directions depicted by H_s. We investigate the impacts of these variables on the correlation structure of return time series.

Table 1: Estimated Hurst index $H_r(\alpha_x, H_x, H_s)$ of return time series generated from the MMF model for fixed $\alpha = 1.3$. The numbers in parentheses are the standard deviations multiplied by 100.

	0.50	0.55	0.60	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
0.50	0.46(1)	0.45(1)	0.45(1)	0.45(1)	0.44(1)	0.44(1)	0.43(1)	0.43(2)	0.42(2)	0.40(2)
0.55	0.47(1)	0.47(1)	0.46(1)	0.46(1)	0.45(1)	0.45(1)	0.44(1)	0.44(2)	0.43(2)	0.41(2)
0.60	0.49(1)	0.49(1)	0.48(1)	0.48(1)	0.47(1)	0.47(1)	0.46(1)	0.46(1)	0.45(2)	0.43(2)
0.65	0.52(1)	0.52(1)	0.51(1)	0.51(1)	0.50(1)	0.50(1)	0.49(1)	0.48(1)	0.47(2)	0.46(2)
0.70	0.55(1)	0.55(1)	0.55(1)	0.54(1)	0.54(1)	0.53(2)	0.52(1)	0.52(1)	0.51(2)	0.49(2)
0.75	0.58(1)	0.58(1)	0.58(1)	0.58(2)	0.57(1)	0.57(1)	0.56(1)	0.55(1)	0.54(2)	0.53(2)
0.80	0.61(1)	0.61(1)	0.61(1)	0.61(1)	0.60(1)	0.60(1)	0.60(1)	0.59(1)	0.58(2)	0.57(2)
0.85	0.63(1)	0.63(1)	0.63(1)	0.63(1)	0.63(1)	0.63(1)	0.62(1)	0.62(1)	0.61(2)	0.60(2)
0.90	0.64(2)	0.64(1)	0.64(1)	0.64(1)	0.64(1)	0.64(1)	0.64(1)	0.64(2)	0.64(2)	0.62(2)
0.95	0.64(1)	0.63(1)	0.64(1)	0.64(2)	0.64(2)	0.65(1)	0.65(1)	0.64(1)	0.65(1)	0.64(2)

2. Model description

The order-driven model of Mike and Farmer (2008) mimics the processes of order placement and order cancellation. An order is determined by its direction, price and size. We denote the order direction by "+1" if it is a buy or "−1" if it is a sell. The time series of order direction has long memory characterized by a Hurst index H_s (Lillo and Farmer, 2004). We can simulate the sequence of order direction using fractional Brownian motions with Hurst index H_s. The logarithmic order price $\pi(t)$ at event time t is determined by the relative price $x(t)$. One defines $x(t) = \pi(t) - \pi_b(t-1)$ for buy orders and $x(t) = \pi_a(t-1) - \pi(t)$ for sell orders, where $\pi_b(t) = \ln b(t)$ and $\pi_a(t) = \ln a(t)$ with $a(t)$ and $b(t)$ being the best ask and bid prices right after the event time t. In the MF model, $x(t)$ follows a student distribution with the freedom degree being α_x. In the MMF model, Gu and Zhou (2009) use an additional ingredient that the relative prices are long-

term correlated with a Hurst index H_x. For simplicity, all orders are set to have the same size (Mike and Farmer, 2008; Gu and Zhou, 2009; Meng et al., 2012).

At each simulation step, we check if the unexecuted orders on the book are cancelled or not. Following Mike and Farmer (2008), for each order on the limit order book, its conditional cancellation probability $P = A(1 - e^{-Y_i})(imb + B)/n_{\text{tot}}$ is calculated, where $A = 1.12$, $B = 0.2$, Y_i is the ratio of the current distance to execution to the initial distance to execution, *imb* is the imbalance of the order book, and n_{tot} is the total number of orders on the order book.

In this way, the processes of order placement and order cancellation can be simulated. Note that an excellent review of the statistical properties of limit order books is given in Gould et al. (2013). In our computational experiments, the tick size is set to be 0.01. The iterative amplitude adjusted Fourier transform approach of Schreiber and Schmitz (1996) is utilized to generate relative prices with preset Hurst indexes.

3. Results

We simulate the MMF model with different combinations of the three parameters, in which the Hurst indexes H_s and H_x range from 0.50 to 0.95 with a step of 0.05 and the tail exponent α_x varies from 1.00 to 1.65 also with a step of 0.05. For each combination (H_s, H_x, α_x), we simulate the MMF model for 100 repeated runs. In each run, we simulate 2×10^5 steps and record the return time series with a length of near 4×10^4 after removing the transient period, where the return is calculated as follows (Mike and Farmer, 2008, pp. 201):

$$r(t) = \frac{\ln a(t) + \ln b(t)}{2} - \frac{\ln a(t-1) + \ln b(t-1)}{2}, \tag{1}$$

which is the immediate price fluctuation at each step (Lillo et al., 2003; Lim and Coggins, 2005; Zhou, 2012a,b).

To determine the Hurst index of each return time series, we adopt the detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) proposed by Peng et al. (1994); Kantelhardt et al. (2001), which is one of the most efficient methods for the estimation of Hurst index (Shao et al., 2012). Each return time series is partitioned into segments of length ℓ and we fit each segment with a linear function. The fluctuation of the sub-series in reference to the linear function is calculated and the average fluctuation



Figure 1: Dedrended fluctuation analysis of five typical return time series generated by the MMF model. In these cases, $\alpha = 1.30$ and $H_x = 0.8$ are fixed while H_s takes different values. The solid lines obtained from linear least-squares regressions show nice power-law relationships between $F(\ell)$ and ℓ.

$F(\ell)$ is determined over all segments. Figure 1 shows the average fluctuation function $F(\ell)$ with respect to the segment size ℓ for five typical return time series. It is evident that these curves exhibit nice power-law relationships. We perform linear least-squares regressions of $\ln F(\ell)$ against $\ln \ell$ within the scaling range $10 \leq \ell < 4500$. The resulting slopes are the estimates of the Hurst indexes of the return time series. It is found that the slope H_r increases with H_x. For each combination of model parameters, the 100 Hurst indexes of the 100 return time series in repeated simulations are computed. We use the mean of these 100 Hurst indexes, denoted by $H_r(\alpha_x, H_x, H_s)$, for further analysis.

We calculate the three Pearson correlation coefficients of the dependent variable H_r and the independent variables α_x, H_s and H_x. In calculating the correlation coefficient between H_r and an independent variable, we ignore the influence of other two variables. We find that $\rho(H_r, \alpha_x) = -0.049$, $\rho(H_r, H_x) = -0.156$, and $\rho(H_r, H_s) = 0.953$. All these correlation coefficients are significantly different from zero at the significance level of 0.001. It suggests that the Hurst index H_r of the returns is negatively correlated with α_x and H_x and positively correlated with H_s. In addition, the value of H_s plays the most influencing role on H_r, consistent with the results in Gu and Zhou (2009).

Because α_x seemingly has the weakest influence on H_r, we first study the impacts of H_x and



Figure 2: Dependence of H_r on H_x for different H_s values (a) and on H_s for different H_x values (b) with fixed $\alpha_x = 1.3$. The lines in (a) are the linear fits to the data points, while the solid curves in (b) are fits with three-order polynomials.

H_s by fixing $\alpha_x = 1.3$. The average Hurst indexes of the return time series are presented in Table 1. The small values of the standard variations in parentheses show the robustness of the MMF model in generating return series. To have a better visibility, we plot the dependence of H_r on H_x for fixed H_s in Fig. 2(a) and on H_s for fixed H_x in Fig. 2(b). We find that H_r decreases with increasing H_x and increases with increasing H_s. According to Fig. 2(a), H_r exhibits nice linear dependence with respect to H_x. The dependence between H_r and H_s in Fig. 2(b) can also be roughly treated as being linear. We thus propose a linear dependence equation and obtain its coefficients as follows

$$H_r = 0.23 - 0.08H_x + 0.52H_s, \tag{2}$$

where all the coefficients are significantly different from 0 and the adjusted R^2 is 0.935. A closer scrutiny of Fig. 2(b) shows that the curves are nonlinear when H_s is close to 0.5 and 0.95. We find that three-order polynomials can fit the data better than a linear function as depicted in Fig. 2(b). This leads to the following equation:

$$H_r = 1.75 - 0.08H_x - 6.23H_s + 9.72H_s^2 - 4.55H_s^3, \tag{3}$$

where all the coefficients are significantly different from 0 and the adjusted R^2 is 0.953.

When the tail exponent α_x of the relative prices is taken into consideration, we propose the

following trivariate linear relationship

$$H_r = 0.25 - 0.02\alpha_x - 0.08H_x + 0.52H_s, \tag{4}$$

where all the coefficients are significantly different from 0 and the adjusted R^2 is 0.935. It is interesting to notice that this equation is very similar to Eq. (2) and the coefficients for H_x and H_s are exactly the same in both equations. The only difference is that the intercept "0.23" in Eq. (2) is replaced by "$0.25 - 0.02\alpha_x$" in Eq. (4). The positive and negative dependence between H_r and the independent variables shown in Eq. (4) is consistent with the results from the Pearson correlation coefficients. When $\alpha_x = 1.3$, $H_x = 0.80$ and $H_s = 0.75$, which are typical values for real stocks (Mike and Farmer, 2008; Gu and Zhou, 2009), we have $H_r = 0.55$, indicating that there is no long-term memory in the return time series.

We now investigate the robustness of the H_r value with respect to the disturbance in α_x, H_x and H_s. According to Eq. (4), we have

$$\Delta H_r = -0.02\Delta\alpha_x, \tag{5}$$

when H_x and H_s are fixed. It means that, if α_x increases by 1, H_r will decrease only by 0.02. Because the variation range of α_x is from 1.0 to 1.65 for stocks traded on the London Stock Exchange (Mike and Farmer, 2008), the variation of H_r caused by α_x is less than 0.01. Hence, we can conclude that the tail heaviness characterized by α_x has a negligible impact on the Hurst index of the output return time series.

When α_x and H_s are fixed, we have

$$\Delta H_r = -0.08\Delta H_x. \tag{6}$$

We note that H_x is close to 0.8 for different stocks in developed market (Zovko and Farmer, 2002) and emerging market (Gu and Zhou, 2009). A value of $\Delta H_x = 0.25$ will result in $\Delta H_r = -0.02$. This explains why both the MF model and the MMF model reach the same conclusion that the generated returns are not long-term correlated (Mike and Farmer, 2008; Gu and Zhou, 2009). It means that the strength of autocorrelations in the relative price characterized by H_x also has a minor impact on the Hurst index of the return time series.

When α_x and H_x are fixed, we have

$$\Delta H_r = 0.52\Delta H_s. \tag{7}$$

It is clear that the strength of long-term correlations H_s in order direction has a dominating impact on H_r. For instance, if H_s increases (or decreases) by 0.2, H_r will increase (or decrease) by 0.1. Consider the real case that $\alpha_x = 1.3$ and $H_x = 0.8$. If there is no memory in order direction such that H_s is close to 0.5, we have $H_r = 0.42$ and the return time series is thus antipersistent. If the correlation in order direction is extremely strong such that $H_s \to 1$, we have $H_r = 0.68$ showing that the returns are persistent.

If we take the nonlinear behavior of H_r against H_s into consideration, we can obtain the following equation:

$$H_r = 1.75 - 0.02\alpha_x - 0.08H_x - 6.11H_s + 9.53H_s^2 - 4.45H_s^3, \tag{8}$$

where all the coefficients differ significantly from 0 and the adjusted R^2 is 0.952. This equation fits the data with a slightly smaller error than Eq. (4). We find that the coefficients for α_x and H_x are the same as in Eq. (4). If $\alpha_x = 1.3$, $H_x = 0.8$ and H_s varies from 0.5 to 1.0, H_r ranges from 0.43 to 0.63.

4. Concluding remarks

In this work, we have performed computational experiments to investigate the impacts of order flow characteristics on the correlation structure in return time series. The statistical properties of the relative prices of placed orders are found to have statistically significant but quantitatively negligible impacts on the Hurst index of returns. In contrast, the long memory effect in order direction plays a dominating role on the Hurst index of returns.

The remarkable impact of the long memory feature of order direction can be explained. The Hurst index of the time series of order direction quantifies the degree of herding in order placement. Stronger herding incurs stronger persistence in the changes of prices. Moreover, the persistence of price changes is more evident because the order size is fixed to 1 and each order will move the mid-price. We note that the results obtained in this work are from the specific artificial stock

market and might differ in real markets. In this respect, careful empirical analysis is require, which is however beyond the scope of this work.

Our findings imply that the correlation structure of return time series is not necessary to be stable over time and so does the efficiency of stock markets. In particular, at small timescales, the Hurst index of returns can fluctuate following the fluctuations in the herding strength of order directions. We can conjecture that the return time series may exhibit long memory if the directions of placed orders are strongly correlated and become antipersistent if order directions are less correlated. These findings provide supportive evidence to the Adaptive Markets Hypothesis proposed by Lo (2004).

Acknowledgements

This work was partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (71101052, 71131007 and 11075054), Program for Changjiang Scholars and Innovative Research Team in University (IRT1028), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

References

Alvarez-Ramirez, J., Alvarez, J., Rodriguez, E., Fernandez-Anaya, G., 2008. Time-varying Hurst exponent for US stock markets. Physica A 387 (24), 6159–6169.

Bachelier, L., March 29 1900. Théorie de la Spéculation. Ph.D. thesis, University of Paris, Paris.

Cajueiro, D. O., Tabak, B. M., 2004. The Hurst's exponent over time: Testing the assertion that emerging markets are becoming more efficient. Physica A 336 (3-4), 521–537.

Cajueiro, D. O., Tabak, B. M., 2008. Testing for long-range dependence in world stock markets. Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 37 (3), 918–927.

Cootner, P. H., 1964. The random character of stock market prices. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Cowles 3rd, A., 1933. Can stock market forecasters forecast? Econometrica 1, 309–324.

Fama, E. F., 1970. Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. Journal of Finance 25 (2), 383–423.

Fama, E. F., 1991. Efficient capital markets: II. Journal of Finance 46 (5), 1575–1617.

Gould, M. D., Porter, M. A., Williams, S., McDonald, M., Fenn, D. J., Howison, S. D., 2013. Limit order books. Quantitative Finance 13 (11), 1709–1742.

Gu, G.-F., Zhou, W.-X., 2009. Emergence of long memory in stock volatilities from a modified Mike-Farmer model. EPL (Europhysics Letters) 86 (4), 48002.

Jiang, Z.-Q., Xie, W.-J., Zhou, W.-X., 2014. Testing the weak-form efficiency of the WTI crude oil futures market. Physica A 40X, in press.

Kantelhardt, J. W., Koscielny-Bunde, E., Rego, H. H. A., Havlin, S., Bunde, A., 2001. Detecting long-range correlations with detrended fluctuation analysis. Physica A 295 (3-4), 441–454.

Kendall, M. G., 1953. The analysis of economic time-series: Part I: Prices. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A 116 (1), 11–34.

Lillo, F., Farmer, J. D., 2004. The long memory of the efficient market. Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics 8 (3), 1–33.

Lillo, F., Farmer, J. D., Mantegna, R., 2003. Master curve for price impact function. Nature 421, 129–130.

Lim, M., Coggins, R., 2005. The immediate price impact of trades on the Australian Stock Exchange. Quantitative Finance 5 (4), 365–377.

Lo, A. W., 2004. The adaptive markets hypothesis. Journal of Portfolio Management 30 (5), 15–29.

Mandelbrot, B., 1966. Forecasts of future prices, unbiased markets, and "martingale" models. Journal of Business 39 (1), 242–255.

Mandelbrot, B. B., 1971. Analysis of long-run dependence in economics: The R/S technique. Econometrica 39 (Suppl.), 68–69.

Mandelbrot, B. B., Van Ness, J. W., 1968. Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications. SIAM Review 10 (4), 422–437.

Meng, H., Ren, F., Gu, G.-F., Xiong, X., Zhang, Y.-J., Zhou, W.-X., Zhang, W., 2012. Effects of long memory in the order submission process on the properties of recurrence intervals of large price fluctuations. EPL (Europhysics Letters) 98 (3), 38003.

Mike, S., Farmer, J. D., 2008. An empirical behavioral model of liquidity and volatility. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control 32 (1), 200–234.

Mishra, R. K., Sehgal, S., Bhanumurthy, N. R., 2011. A search for long-range dependence and chaotic structure in Indian stock market. Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 20 (2), 96–104.

Osborne, M. F. M., 1959. Brownian motion in the stock market. Operations Research 7 (2), 145–173.

Peng, C.-K., Buldyrev, S. V., Havlin, S., Simons, M., Stanley, H. E., Goldberger, A. L., 1994. Mosaic organization of DNA nucleotides. Physical Review E 49 (2), 1685–1689.

Samuelson, P. A., 1965. Proof that properly anticipated prices fluctuate randomly. Industrial Management Review 6 (2), 41–49.

Schreiber, T., Schmitz, A., 1996. Improved surrogate data for nonlinearity tests. Physical Review Letters 77 (2), 635–638.

Shao, Y.-H., Gu, G.-F., Jiang, Z.-Q., Zhou, W.-X., Sornette, D., 2012. Comparing the performance of FA, DFA and DMA using different synthetic long-range correlated time series. Scientific Reports 2, 835.

Working, H., 1934. A random-difference series for use in the analysis of time series. Journal of the American Statistical Association 29 (185), 11–24.

Zhou, W.-X., 2012a. Determinants of immediate price impacts at the trade level in an emerging order-driven market. New Journal of Physics 14 (9), 023055.

Zhou, W.-X., 2012b. Universal price impact functions of individual trades in an order-driven market. Quantitative Finance 12 (8), 1253–1263.

Zovko, I., Farmer, J. D., 2002. The power of patience: A behavioural regularity in limit-order placement. Quantitative Finance 2 (5), 387–392.